UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,277	02/13/2001	Dominique Therese Marie Frechon	P66034US0	5117
	7590 11/24/200 OLMAN PLLC	EXAMINER		
	STREET N.W.	DUFFY, PATRICIA ANN		
SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1645		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/674,277	FRECHON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

		Tatriola 7t. Barry	1040
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE	REPLY FILED <u>06 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
1. 🛚	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a)	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b)	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
have I under set foi may re	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(sions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sthin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office latereduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origiten than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
	filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extended Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water than the NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. 🛚	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, land They raise new issues that would require further contains the same of the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, land the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, land the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, land the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, land the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, land the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, land the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection (s) filed after a		
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		,,
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	· ·	ducing or simplifying the issues for
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.
4. 			mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. 🖂	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant, information (1 1 02 02 1).
6.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendment canceling the
7. 🛚			l be entered and an explanation of
<u>AFFII</u>	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
8. 🗌	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
9. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio JEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see continuation sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
		/D-1:: A D # /	
		/Patricia A. Duffy/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1645

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants "typo" increases the breath of the claim by increasing the range of nucleotides to be considered and requires a new search that was not previously preformed.

Continuation of 11. The allowable material discussed indicated 30 consecutive nucleotides and the range of the amendment filed 7-28-08. There was no discussion of the "typo" and no discussion of the cited range. The typo could not have been anticipated by the examiner because the range was not previously stated in any claim in any prior amendment.

With respect to the "at least 30" argument, the specifiation at page 8, lines 13-23 clearly and unambigously gives specific ranges and specifically define an upper limit on the range "up to" 30 consecutive nucleotides. As such, reliance on this passage for "at least" 30 consecutive nucleotides is missplaced. The specification describes two 31 nucleotide consecutive chains (SEQ ID NOs 25 and 26). Applicants alledges that the upper limit combined with two 31mers provides conception for "at least 30".. this is not persuasive, because the pagssage of page 8 has a definite upper limit and description of two 31 mers does not provide conception for 32 or more. Applicants are mixing and matching conflicting statements in different parts of the specification to arrive at a subgenus that is not supported by the written description of the specification. It cannot be said that a subgenus is necessarily described by a genus encompassing it and a species upon which it reads. In re Smith 173 USPQ 679, 683 (CCPA 1972). See MPEP 2163.05(b). Such limitations recited in the present claims, which did not appear in the specification, as filed, introduce new concepts and violate the description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is noted that entitlement to a filing date does not extend to subject matter which is not disclosed, but would be obvious over what is expressly disclosed. Lockwood v. American Airlines Inc., 41 USPQ2d 1961 (Fed. Cir. 1977).